

REMARKS

Status of Claim

Claims 1-23 are present for examination.

Claim Objections

The claims are objected to as stated in paragraph 1 of the outstanding Office Action.

Applicant has attempted to incorporate the changes suggested by the Examiner. In most cases, these changes have been made. However, in several places the changes have not been made as they are not deemed to be appropriate or alternative changes have been made instead. Applicant will refer to the original page and line numbering of the claims to be consistent with the identification of the claims as made by the Examiner in paragraph 1 of the outstanding Office Action. However, it should be appreciated that the pagination of the claims in the present amendment is different from that of the originally filed claims and, thus, the line numbering will not be the same. However, because track changes has been utilized to identify the changes made in the claims, the Examiner should readily be able to locate the corresponding changes in the present amendment.

As to claim 1, original line 13, applicant has inserted -- a header -- instead of the suggested "header".

In claim 3, line 2, applicant has not deleted the term "the" as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant feels that this term is correct. Antecedent basis for the error detection area is found in the last line of claim 1.

As to claim 4, original line 2, applicant has not deleted the second occurrence of the word "the" as suggested by the Examiner. This term refers to "the payload area." Proper antecedent basis for the payload area appears in claim 1, line 15. Thus, it is deemed that the term "the" is appropriate. In claim 4, line 3, applicant has not deleted the term "the" as suggested by the Examiner. Rather, the term "entire" has been deleted. There is proper antecedent basis for the term "frame" but there was not clear antecedent basis for "entire frame". Thus, the term "entire" was deleted.

As to claim 5, original line 2, the Examiner suggested deleting the term “the”, second occurrence. However, the term “the” has been retained and the next word, namely, “entire” has been deleted as explained above.

As to claim 5, line 3, the Examiner suggested deleting the term “the”, first occurrence. Applicant has deleted this term but has also inserted the term “a”. This term is consistent with subsequent changes requested by the Examiner with regard to similar terminology utilized in other claims.

With regard to claim 5, line 7, the Examiner suggested deleting the term “the”, first occurrence. However, there is proper antecedent basis for “error detection area” (see claim 1, last line) and thus it is submitted that the term “the” is appropriate.

Rejections Under Section 112

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner indicates that certain terminology is not understood.

Applicant has removed the objected to terminology and has replaced same with simpler terminology which is readily understandable. It is submitted that these changes clearly remove the grounds of rejection under § 112.

Applicant notes that no prior art rejections have been applied against applicant’s claims.

Conclusions

It is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance and an early indication of same is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a

check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 8-17-04

By David A. Blumenthal

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,257